



INFORMATION BULLETIN

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Employment Development Department

Number: B97-113

Date: March 19, 1998

Expiration Date: 6/30/98

69:127:is

TO: SERVICE DELIVERY AREA ADMINISTRATORS
PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL CHAIRPERSONS
EDD JOB SERVICE MANAGERS
EDD WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH STAFF

SUBJECT: SERVICE DELIVERY AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

The summary of the February 6, 1998, Service Delivery Area (SDA) Advisory Committee meeting is attached. If you have any questions regarding the summary, please contact:

Brett Lapp (916) 653-3560 (phone)
(916) 654-8039 (fax)
blapp@edd.ca.gov (e-mail address)

/S/ BILL BURKE
Acting Assistant Deputy Director

Attachments

**SERVICE DELIVERY AREA
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING NOTES
FEBRUARY 6, 1998
800 CAPITOL MALL, DIRECTOR'S CONFERENCE ROOM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA**

EIGHT PERCENT/30 PERCENT FUNDING

Ray Eberhart, representing the California Department of Education (CDE), proposed a new fund distribution mechanism for the estimated \$4 million in program year (PY) 1998/99 Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) 8 percent/30 percent funds. The new fund distribution proposal is part of the CDE implementation of SB 394 (January 1, 1998) which mandates that JTPA 8 percent/30 percent funds be used to support work-based learning of the School-to-Careers program.

The CDE fund distribution proposal centers on SDAs applying for funding via a Request For Application (RFA) process. The funding request component of the RFA is primarily driven by two factors: the \$10 per hour average rate for paid work experience¹ and the estimated number of paid work experience hours requested for the program participants. If the aggregated funding requests exceed the actual dollars available, a prorated adjustment would be made to all requests.

The proposed new funding distribution mechanism is a significant departure from previous distribution practices involving these funds. Many concerns were raised by the SDA Advisory Committee regarding the CDE proposal. One concern of note centered on the RFA process appearing too labor-intensive for the amount of funding involved.

The SDA Advisory Committee suggested CDE consider distributing the funds in the following manner: each SDA be guaranteed a minimum level of funding—to be determined and the remaining funds distributed using the Title II-C fund allocation, table percentages. Mr. Eberhart agreed to take this suggestion back to CDE for consideration and he stated that he would inform the SDA Advisory Committee when a decision was made.

¹ The March 1998 federal minimum wage increase to \$5.75, along with normal payroll deduction costs, workers Compensation Insurance fees, and service provider administrative costs are some of the costs factors considered by CDE in arriving at the \$10 per hour average rate.

WELFARE-TO-WORK

Public Hearings

Dean Smith of the State Job Training Coordinating Council went over a handout (attached) that summarizes the major issues and written comments obtained during public hearings on the state's Welfare-to-Work (WtW) plan.

Comments of note include but were not limited to the following:

- Many respondents were concerned that the performance goals were unrealistic and did not take into consideration that the WtW program will be serving the hardest-to-serve welfare recipients and that County Welfare Departments (CWDs) would like to see the performance goals aligned with the CalWORKs program;
- The Private Industry Council (PIC)/CWD review of 15 percent projects should be for comments and sign-off, not for approval;
- Many respondents expressed concern regarding the lack of clarity in the definitions of allowable activities; there was disagreement as to whether the State should define allowable activities but the respondents recommended that a work group should be established to review and clarify the definitions;
- Concern was raised that the 13 percent PIC administrative cap is not sufficient;
- Some respondents felt that the allocation of funds should not be dependent upon submission of local plans; also the point was made that because federal regulations require that funds must be disbursed within 30 days, the timeline for development, review, and approval of local plans is unrealistic;
- There was disagreement between some PICs and CWDs regarding sign-off authority on the local plans—the CWDs want to be included in the sign-off process; and
- The CWA interprets language in the state plan as granting the County Board of Supervisors discretionary authority over the formula grant funds to the PICs.

Further concern was expressed by some SDA Advisory Committee members regarding local plan instructions and the requirement for county supervisor sign-off, which they felt would allow county's to stop the clearance of the plan and subsequent program funding which is against federal regulations.

In addition, the SDA Advisory Committee expressed concern regarding the use of match resources in that there is no requirement of CWDs to coordinate their planning efforts in using match resources nor is there structure for CWD accountability in the use of such resources. This presents the danger of competition amongst entities that should be coordinating their service delivery.

Question and Answers

Kathy Sage of the Employment Development Department Workforce Development Branch informed the SDA Advisory Committee that the State is continuing to work on the proposed language for WtW legislation. Some SDA Advisory Committee members asked why the work participation rate is so high, noting that the CalWORKs work participation rate is only 30 percent. In addition, WtW regulations will require earning gains, not just wage at placement. The SDA Advisory Committee expressed that they would like the WtW performance goals to be more closely aligned with CalWORKs performance goals from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act.

There was also discussion as to whether an SDA could use agreements set up under JTPA and CalWORKs for WtW. Kathy responded that the agreements must be modified to apply to WtW.

The question was asked as to why local providers need to provide match? Kathy responded that by coming up with match, it shows the state legislature, and administration that there is local partnering/collaboration.

MISCELLANEOUS UPDATES AND INFORMATION

Electronic Communications Project: The JTPD is moving forward with computer hardware purchases for SDA internet linkage. Liz Clingman, Manager of the JTPD SDA Support Section, reported significant progress is being made in resolving the encryption/decryption software challenges encountered earlier in the project.

Welfare-to-Work Town Hall Meetings: The SDA Advisory Committee proposed that EDD put town hall-type meetings together around the state in which the agenda would include a discussion of WtW and a presentation from associate(s) of Greg Newton or similar consultants. Potential invitees include County Welfare Agencies, Department of Social Services, Trade and Commerce, and other WtW partners.

JTPA Allotments from the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL): Information was provided to the SDA Advisory Committee regarding JTPA allotments from DOL. A handout was supplied (attached) that compared PYs 1997/98 and 1998/99 allotments and the dollar amount increase/decrease for each Title.

Waivers: The JTPD continues to work with DOL and the SDA community to gain final approval of the State's JTPA waiver plan. Additional information was forwarded to DOL to clarify certain aspects of the state waivers proposal. The open issue continues to be how to measure performance improvement as a result of waivers implementation.

Title III Flood Disaster Grant Status: The Title III flood Disaster Grant has been completed. As required by law, the Department is waiting for the Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster declaration before forwarding to DOL.

Assembly Bill (AB)1610 - Michelle Montoya Law: The EDD contacted the CDE legal office to discuss how AB 1610 may significantly impede the SDAs' JTPA Summer Youth placement efforts and the options available to the SDAs to mitigate the law's potential

adverse impact on the program. The CDE responded that the SDAs should work with the local schools to coordinate their program activities.

Welfare-to-Work 25 Percent DOL Grant Solicitation: The SDA Advisory Committee was informed that EDD has established the process so that JTPA program operators can submit their applications to the state for comment. The process was established to comply with federal solicitation requirements and to ensure that the applicants would receive state comments in time to meet the DOL filing deadline.

Senate Bill (SB) 645 - Performance Reporting: The two focus group sessions on SB 645 were well received. The SDAs' assistance was appreciated and the state will consider their input into the design of the SB 645 reporting system.

3:10 p.m. - Meeting adjourned.

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT
ALLOTMENTS FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

		1997/98	1998/99	INCREASE/ (DECREASE) 97/98 - 1998/99
TITLE II-A		\$ 153,250,166	\$ 151,779,899	\$ (1,470,267)
PROGRAMS	77%	118,002,629	116,870,522	\$ (1,132,107)
EDUCATION	8%	12,260,013	12,142,392	\$ (117,621)
INCENTIVE	5%	7,662,508	7,588,995	\$ (73,513)
STATE	5%	7,662,508	7,588,995	\$ (73,513)
ADMINISTRATION				
OLDER WORKER	5%	7,662,508	7,588,995	\$ (73,513)
TITLE II-B				
SUMMER YOUTH		\$ 150,622,655	\$ 140,130,051	\$ (10,492,604)
TITLE II-C		\$ 22,286,883	\$ 21,277,025	\$ (1,009,858)
PROGRAMS	82%	18,275,244	17,447,161	\$ (828,083)
EDUCATION	8%	1,782,951	1,702,162	\$ (80,789)
INCENTIVE	5%	1,114,344	1,063,851	\$ (50,493)
STATE	5%	1,114,344	1,063,851	\$ (50,493)
ADMINISTRATION				
TOTAL TITLE II		326,159,704	313,186,975	\$ (12,972,729)
TITLE III		\$ 226,611,355	\$ 228,452,063	\$ 1,840,708
DISPLACED WORKERS				
	50%	113,305,678	114,226,032	\$ 920,354
	40%	90,644,542	91,380,825	\$ 736,283
	10%	22,661,135	22,845,206	\$ 184,071
TOTAL (ALL TITLES)		\$ 552,771,059	\$ 541,639,038	\$ (11,132,021)